

		<u></u> (,:	Best Availa	UNITED STATES Patent and Trac	lemark Offic	ENT OF COMMERCE e NTS AND TRADEMARKS
ŀ	SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FI	RST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
ارا	<b>/613.525_0</b> 5	/24/84	LOCKMOOD		L	0088
ſ	_					EXAMINER
	ARMASSON & H 50 KEARNY VI		202	MILLS, J		
ŝΑi	N DIEGO, CA	92123		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
					237	5
					DATE MAILED:	12/06/84

	This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.					
	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS					
This a	epplication has been examined Responsive to communication filed on	☐ This action is made final.				
A shortene ailure to	ed statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s), days from the respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 13					
'art I L 🔄 3. 🔲 5. 🔲	THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474  6.					
art II	SUMMARY OF ACTION					
1. 🖫	Claims 1-10	are pending in the application.				
	Of the above, claims	are withdrawn from consideration.				
2. 🗌	Claims	have been cancelled.				
3.	Claims	are allowed.				
4. 🗷	Claims	are rejected.				
. <b>5.</b> , .	Claims	are objected to.				
6.	Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.					
7. 11	This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes matter is indicated.	until such time as allowable subject				
8.	-Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office	e action.				
9.	The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on These drawin These drawin	gs areacceptable;				
10.	The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).					
11.	The proposed drawing correction, filed	ty to ensure that the drawings are				
12. 🗀	Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received					
	been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on;	•				
13:	Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution a accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	s to the merits is closed in				
14. []	Other					
		•				

ŤOL-326 (Rev. 7 - 82)

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 237

The specification is objected to under 35
U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention. This paragraph of the statute requires that the specification shall contain a written description of the invention and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification as currently drafted does not set forth any of the special purpose logic or circuitry necessary for the applicant to implement his invention of a automated information system. The applicant merely mentions the functional requirements of his invention but fails to give any of the hardware details of how these functional requirements would be carried out. For example, the invention requires a central processing center which will store and manage all of the data from sales transactions made at remote terminals but the applicant merely specifies on page 12 of the specification that the central data processing center includes a central processing unit and memory. At no point in the specification does the applicant give the details of how specific hardware components would be linked together in an operative fashion so as to accomplish the information management of the terminals

and other processing features required by the system. In fact, the applicant never even gives the software requirements which would be needed to permit the unmentioned hardware components to interface in a meaningful way so that the routineer in the art could make and use the invention. The applicant on page 12, the applicant states that the "interfacing of the various components of the terminal 2 described above is done according to standard practices well known to those skilled in the electronic arts. The examiner submits that the level of sophistication needed to implement  ${}^{\ast}$ this system with its simulation of customer and client interaction would not be readily known to one skilled in the electronic arts and that the applicant needs to better detail the hardware and software essentials which would be necessary to carry out his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 1-10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing toparticularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the claim appears vague and indefinite in that it is not clear what sort of means in the central processing unit would store service and price information for each institution and customer, i.e. is this a bulk memory or a solid state memory. It

3

Art Unit: 237

is also not clear what is meant by the sales and information terminal including a programmable means for carrying out a predetermined sequence of operations, i.e. how is this means programmable and by whom is it programmed. It is also not clear what would be the "means for gathering a predetermined sequence of information from a customer", i.e. is this a keyboard or some other input means. It is also not clear what would be the "means for accepting customer orders", i.e. how are these orders accepted. How are services "dispensed" to the customer. What is the means "responsive to a customer sales order ... for processing said order, up-dating said sales information, and transmitting the order."

The claim appears to set forth merely an assembly of parts and fails to distinctly point out how this combination of parts would function together to accomplish the applicant's invention.

In claim 2, line 3, it is not clear whether the applicant means a "credit information terminal" when he in fact states "sales terminal".

In claim 3, there appears to be no antecedent basis for the term "credit information collecting means" in claim 2.

In claim 4, the claim is vague in that it does not particularly point out how the self-service sales and information terminals are "remotely linked" to the central processing data center.

Art Unit: 237

In claim 5, it is not clear how the link provided is "indirect"; does the applicant intend that this link is "restricted" rather than indirect.

In claim 6, it is not clear how the audio visual means is programmed to dispense selected. information and to ask a series of questions.

In claim 7, it is not clear how the audio-visual means "supplies" the display unit with a series of questions.

In claim 8, it is not clear how the display unit can comprise a touch screen and the keyboard can be a touch pad on the screen.

In claim 9, there appears to be no antecedent basis for the "means for dispensing information and services to the customer" in claim 1.

In claim 10, it is not clear how the data processing terminals are associated with insurance companies and how the sales ... terminals include means for dispensing insurance quotes.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

Art Unit: 237

at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Lockwood et al. U.S. Patent 4,359,631. The examiner submits that the Lockwood teaching of self-service terminal which is interfaced to a remote computer system for control and updating. The details of the applicant's independent claim are seen to correspond to the cited reference as follows:

- a) The central data processing center is shown by Lockwood as the remote control center and its computer 42.
- b) The customer sales and information terminal is shown by Lockwood as the self service terminals shown by Lockwood as element 1 and discussed on column 2 lines 63 and following. Each of the additional features claimed by the applicant in the sales and information terminal such as the means for gathering information, the means for accepting customer orders for goods, and the means for dispensing services to the customer have all been taught by Lockwood in his discussion of the self service terminal on Columns 3 and 4.
- c) The means for processing customer orders, updating sales information, and transmitting orders to the terminal to dispense the ordered services are also

7

taught by Lockwood as the function of the remote site computer 42 which periodically updates and controls the self service terminal. (See column 3 and column 2)

However, the Lockwood teaching does not specifically teach the means for "periodically transmitting customer sales information for each institution to its associated terminal, and the means for periodically collecting and storing service and price rate information from each institution terminal. However, this additional terminal type for each sales institution would be obvious in view of the notion of expandability which Lockwood has built into this self service terminal system as discussed on line 39, Column 8. As stated on column 2, the self service terminal is intended to be controlled either remotely or locally and the addition of an institutional terminal for monitoring the sales of that institution would be an obvious modification of the current system. The current system already teaches one type of remote control as the remote computer 42 and it would be obvious to any one understanding the network capabilities of such a system to add additional terminals which may be associated with the sales or with institutions monitoring the sales at self service terminals.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of this office action or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Mills whose telephone number is (703) 557-8034. Any inquiry of a general

Art Unit: 237

nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 557-2878.

WARETH D. SHAW

PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE

ART UNIT 237

- ---